

REMARKS

The Official Action dated August 7, 2007, the Examiner rejected pending claims 1-23 and 25-47. Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection in light of the following discussion.

The Examiner recognizes that the JP (403-163245) does not teach or suggest an indicator for indicating the bias of the tensioner. To fill this gap in the teaching, the Examiner relies upon St. John 4,957,471. However, this combination still does not teach or suggest the features of the claims.

Specifically, among other elements, claim 1 recites

an indicator operable to indicate which direction is the preferred direction when the biasing element is in a relaxed state.


The official action never addresses the fact that the claimed indicator is operable to indicate the preferred direction when the biasing element is in the relaxed state. Nothing in St. John '471 or any other cited reference teaches such a feature. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claim 1 and the claims that depend from claim 1. Similar differences are found in each of the remaining independent claims, so that Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection. Further, since the features of the indicator are not found in the claims of 6,855,079, the obviousness type double patenting rejection is also inappropriate.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant believes that this application is in form for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney if the Examiner believes that issues remain regarding the allowability of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN
A Professional Corporation
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Stephen H. Eland
PTO Registration No. 41,010

Telephone: (215) 563-4100
Facsimile: (215) 563-4044